


MAY 02 2007

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030620US1
Serial No. 10/666,813
Response to Office Action mailed April 10, 2007

II. REMARKS

1. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The examiner rejected claims 27-37 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claims 27-37 to address the rejection. Specifically the claims have been amended to recite instructions to cause a computer to perform a variety of actions as stated in the claims.
2. Claim objections. The examiner objected to Claims 1, 4-6, 13, 14, 17-19, 26, 28-29, 37 because of the examiner did not know the metes and bounds created by the word "allowing." Applicant has amended the claims to more particularly point out what has been allowed in each case where the term is used.
3. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-27, and 29-37 as being unpatentable over Zhao (US 6,035,404) in view of Gupta. (US 6,516,315). The examiner also indicated that claims 6, 19, and 28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitation of the intervening claims. Applicant has incorporated claims 6, 19, and 28 into the corresponding independent claim as well as the intervening claims.
4. Therefore, applicant submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Registration No. 37,720
Gordon & Rees LLP
Suite 2650
2100 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201
214-461-4050
214-461-4053 (fax)
rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com

Page 10 of 10